

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 13, and 18-23 are pending in this case.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 13, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Choi (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0035920), and Claims 3, 9, and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Choi in view of Um, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0133055, herein "Um").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the pending claims.

Claim 2 is directed to an array substrate for a flat-panel display and includes "a pixel-electrode cutout being formed by **rectangularly removing a pixel electrode throughout an area ranging from the vicinity of the area containing wire breakage to a place receiving the bypass wire, which extends along an edge of the pixel-electrode cutout.**"

The outstanding Office Action cites Choi as teaching all the elements of Claim 2.

Choi depicts, at Figures 2, 3D, and 4D, and describes, at paragraph [0053], a manner of repairing a short circuit between a scan line 21 and a data line 23 that includes a repair pattern 25 with cut-outs at the corners of each of the electrodes 27 and 27a.

However, the cut-outs of Choi do not teach or suggest "rectangularly removing a pixel electrode **throughout an area ranging from the vicinity of the area containing wire breakage to a place receiving the bypass wire, which extends along an edge of the pixel-electrode cutout,**" as recited by amended Claim 2. Instead, Choi depicts, at Fig. 2, and describes, at paragraph [0058], corners of two electrodes 27 and 27a cut out such that neither cutout ranges from a vicinity of the area containing wire breakage, but, rather, both range

from an area above or below the wire breakage, and the bypass wire does not extend along an edge of the cutout but, rather, is overlaid on the surface of the remnants of the pixel electrodes 27 and 27a.

Because Choi does not teach or suggest at least the above-discussed features of amended Claim 2, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, and 18-20 depend from Claim 2 and, therefore, patentably define over Choi for at least the same reasons as Claim 2. Further, Um, which is additionally asserted against Claims 3 and 18-20, does not cure the deficiencies of Choi with regard to Claim 2. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 3, 4, and 18-20 be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 8 are directed to a method for manufacturing an array substrate for a flat-panel display and include:

forming a cutout, which is a **solid region cut out from a linear fringe on one of the pixel electrodes** by removing a conductive film comprising said one of the pixel electrodes at a vicinity of the wire breakage, on one or both areas demarcated by said wire having the wire breakage, by laser irradiation; and forming a **bypass wire detouring the wire breakage** and electrically connecting two wire parts interlaying the wire breakage, by sequential or continuous depositing of a conductive layer **at an inside edge of said cutout to run along the edge of said cutout at a preset distance from said edge**, using laser CVD technique.

Choi does not teach or suggest forming a cutout or forming a bypass wire as defined by Claims 7 and 8. As depicted at Fig. 2 and discussed at paragraph [0039], the cutouts from pixel electrodes 27 and 27a of Choi are not solid regions cut out from a linear fringe on the

pixel electrodes 27 and 27a but, rather, are corner pieces of pixel electrodes 27 and 27a. Further, the bypass wire 25 is not at an inside edge but, rather, on the corner cutout pieces of pixel electrodes 27 and 27a.


Because Choi does not teach or suggest every element of Claims 7 and 8, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 13, and 21-23 depend from Claims 7 and 8 and, therefore, patentably define over Choi for at least the same reasons as Claims 7 and 8. Further, Um, which is additionally asserted against Claims 9, 21, and 22, does not cure the deficiencies of Choi with regard to Claims 7 and 8. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 9, 13, and 21-23 be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Usha Munukutla-Parker
Registration No. 61,939